

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 6-13 and 21 are allowed. Claims 1, 14, 15, 16, and 22 are being amended. Claims 23-24 have been added. No new matter is being added.

Applicants express appreciation for the Examiner Interview with Examiner Mehdi Namazi and Applicants Attorney David G. Dolezal on July 7, 2003. During the interview, the claims and prior art were discussed.

In Section 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, Section 3 states that "as per claims 1 and 16, 'first storage element and second storage element' is not supported by the specification.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. Applicants specifically point out that claims 1 and 16 were originally filed with this application. Furthermore, Applicants cite Figure 2 of the application as setting forth a plurality of addressable storage elements 212.

Claims 6-13 and 21 have been allowed and claims 15 and 22 stand objected to but would be allowable if written in independent form. Applicants express appreciation for the allowance and indication of allowability of these claims. Claims 15 and 22 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of pending claim 14.

Claims 1-4 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Young et al. (Young) (U.S. Patent No. 5,285,421). Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young, and further in view of Lee et al. (Lee) (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,504).

Young and Lee, either alone or in combination, do not disclose suggest a memory system wherein a bit of the second portion of a group of bits of an address is more significant than a bit of the first portion of the group of bits of the address, all as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Young and Lee.

Young and Lee, either alone or in combination, do not disclose suggest an embedded control system wherein a bit of the second portion is more significant than a bit of the first portion, all as recited in claim 14. Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable over Young and Lee.

Young and Lee, either alone or in combination, do not disclose suggest a method of accessing a memory system wherein a bit of the second portion is more significant than a bit of the first portion, all as recited in claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over Young and Lee.

Each dependent claim in this application depends from an independent claim and is therefore allowable for at least this reason.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 502117.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David G. Dolezal
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 41,711
Telephone: (512) 996-6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854